

# THE FACULTY UNION BULLETIN

Published by the UCR Local (No. 1966) of The United Professors of California (American Federation of Teachers)

Vol. 1, No. 2

## THE BULLETIN

*We repeat our standing invitation to all members of the faculty and library staff to use The Bulletin as a forum for information or viewpoints of interest to all of us. Send contributions to Roger Pierce, Theatre Department.*

## UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

### The McCorkle Committee Report

On December 17 members of the Senate had the opportunity of discussing with their Divisional Advisory Committee the contents of the third draft of the "Interim Statement of University of California Policy and Procedures on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline." About 30 faculty members appeared; one suspects that most of the rest have no idea of the significance of this document to their professional life—nor indeed, given the secrecy that has surrounded the report, of its very existence.

The McCorkle Committee report in its present form purports to summarize "statements, regulations and policies which bear on matters of professional responsibility, faculty conduct, and faculty discipline," and to spell out the administrative authorities responsible for administering given disciplinary actions. A copy of the report is available to all Senate members in departmental offices and at the Academic Senate office. It has been in preparation for the past quarter by a task force headed by Vice-President McCorkle, with hasty and secret consultations from divisional Advisory, Educational Policy, Academic Freedom and Privilege and Tenure committees. (The present draft was received on campus a few days before the December 17 Meeting; the response of the Riverside division was due back by December 21.)

Faculty response as it appeared in the December 17 meeting can be summarized as follows:

1. A professional is almost by definition a member of a group which defines its own code of ethics. The imposition of a code by an administrative agency acting under outside political pressures is intolerable.

2. The material offered as a basis for discipline is a loose and miscellaneous collection of speeches, regents' promulgations, statements by agencies outside the university, etc. and not a coherent code of conduct.

3. Since the regulations cited and the disciplinary machinery are already in existence, what need is there for an interim policy from President Hitch? He should wait for the faculty's own pronouncement on professional conduct and discipline, presently being developed by the Academic Senate.

4. The faculty is again being made the whipping-boy of partisan politics swirling around the University. The tone of the whole document is repressive and, coming at this time, carries strong overtones of threat against the expression of unpopular political opinions.

5. The provisions for due process, particularly the role of privilege and tenure committees in appeal, are weak and do not provide a guarantee against administrative unfairness.

The question was also raised as to the propriety of Senate committees being willing to submit to administrative fiat in maintaining the secrecy of events of such significance to the other members of the Senate. The McCorkle Committee report has been under consideration for about two months on this campus, and to date most members of the Senate are either totally ignorant of its existence or unclear as to its significance. The various committees who worked (in an advisory capacity) on the report felt that it was more important to try to influence its content than to make an issue of its secrecy; one suggestion at the December 17 meeting was that the Senate draw up a set of regulations as to what kind of secret work it will engage in, to protect itself from such demands at the whim of the administration.

Another concrete suggestion regarding the whole issue of ethics and discipline was that the Senate itself should speedily draw up a codification of the rules and procedures under which it has operated in the past and should insist upon these: solidify our position and stand by it.

Roger Pierce

★

### Faculty Behavior

The faculty has been ordered to state its position on faculty behavior and "discipline" for faculty. Such an order would be redundant if it referred to lazy or inept faculty. We have always policed ourselves carefully so that the lazy or those utterly unable to meet their duties are fired. Nor would there be any excitement over the issue by the Regents, Governor, or legislature if we were only discussing laziness or ineptness.

The real issue is an attempt to censor the *political* thoughts and behavior of the faculty. This point has been made perfectly explicit by the statement that the purpose of these new rules is to prevent any repetition of the political activity shown by the faculty during the Cambodia crisis. In fact, it appears that the aim is to legitimate some rules with faculty agreement that can then be used for wholesale firings of faculty, both non-tenured and tenured, during the next political confrontation. The motivation for such rules is further shown in the emphasis on course content, keeping exactly to stated content, not making any political statements in class, and having investigating

committees to check on what faculty say in classes (see the President's guidelines on teaching undergraduates, point 4A).

Perhaps we need reminding on the dangers of censorship:

"If all mankind minus one were aware of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind. We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is false opinion, and if we were sure, stifling it would still be evil."

John Stuart Mill

Moreover, we need reminding of the elementary point that "discipline" applied to someone who seems way out may next be applied to all of us: "It behooves every man who values liberty of conscience for himself to resist invasions of it in the case of others, or their case may by change of circumstances become his own." (Thomas Jefferson)

There is also a contradiction in all the instructions we have received. Both the President and Chancellor (and the Chancellor's "task force") tell us that we must experiment and innovate to improve our teaching. Yet at the same time we are warned not to make the slightest mistep from our scheduled and ordained time, place, and exact content of teaching. Any significant change in our courses must now be reported and approved by higher authorities. Moreover, we are told that our teaching is to be subject to investigating committees in the classroom—and our students have been asked to inform on any deviation we make from approved routine (and especially any political deviation).

Next, a red herring has been tossed into this discussion. The President and the Chancellor both speak as if the University is being politicized by its faculty and students. The pompous "Chancellor's task force" talks of politicization mainly in terms of faculty "abuses." "One possible abuse consists in departing from course content and using the classroom as a rostrum for personal or political prejudices." Notice this is a "possible" abuse, and even they admit that such has *not* been the case in any large number of instances.

On the contrary, the real situation is that powerful forces outside the University are trying to politicize it in their own way, while faculty and students have been defending it against political intrusion. The federal government, which uses the University for research into biological and nuclear warfare (Livermore and Los Alamos), politicizes the University. The police in Berkeley who broke heads and killed a man over the People's Park, and who tear gassed the entire UC campus—these are the people who have politicized the University. The Governor, who has initiated almost every confrontation, has politicized the University. The state legislature, who denied a raise to professors and only to professors for political reasons (incidentally punishing the librarians with them), has politicized the University. The Regents and the legislature, who have agreed to tie faculty work loads to the budget (and thus to initiate a "speed-up"), have politicized the University. The Regents who raised tuition, so that the poor cannot enter the University, have politicized the University.

The Regents, who fired Angela Davis for political reasons, and who held up the tenure of two other professors for political reasons, have politicized the University. We are being politically attacked, we are being treated like employees; yet we are prohibited not only from striking, but even from making any political noises.

These attacks on the University and its members can only be seen in the broader national context. We have committed the cardinal sin of opposing the foreign policy of the present administration, of calling the Vietnam war a filthy war, a war opposed to the interests of the vast majority of both Americans and Vietnamese. The Nixon administration requires a silencing of their most vocal opposition, so Spiral Agony and Reagan and others are out to make sure that we conform. This seems to me the real function of these attacks.

And to some extent they have succeeded. There is a considerable aura of fear around the University. There is an attempt to get the University and the faculty to silence itself with new rules.

We can only reaffirm the traditional rules for faculty. *It is necessary that a faculty member do an adequate job of teaching his courses. Period. We must continue to have the freedom to teach when and where we think educationally best.* If it is best to hold a seminar at home, that must be allowed. If it is best to cancel classes sometime to let students study more outside of class, that must be allowed. And of course, *we must have the right to change and improve our course content to keep up with the changing world and changing knowledge.* In fact, if experiment and innovation means anything, these are practices that must be encouraged. The alternative is a course content that says nothing controversial and says it the same way year after year.

What to do about it? We don't have vast money or influence, but we do have numbers. We can organize. We have organized in the past through the Academic Senate and the AAUP. These are fine and should continue to be used. But they have been largely ineffectual forms in the past, the Academic Senate being unwieldy as well as indecisive. At the present time, therefore, the Union does seem the best form for us to rally in, both to fight for bread and butter issues and to protect our academic freedom to speak out when necessary.

Howard J. Sherman

Professor of Economics

President, UCR local of the American Federation  
of Teachers (for identification only)

☆ ★ ☆

### The Academic Senate

Several of us in United Professors of California have been circulating among our fellow toilers in the vineyard to see if we can't persuade more faculty members to join the union. In the presence of such clear and present danger to academic freedom and the very existence of the academic profession in California, we have anticipated a high degree of success for our efforts. In fact, we have been much more



successful than in prior years—a sure sign of dawning awareness that the world we live in is no safer for professors than it is for any other body of workers and that we will not be taken care of either by public officials or private philanthropists. Despite the awakening of some, however, many still persist in the illusion that as a body of professional colleagues we can take care of ourselves within the structure of the organization set up for our benefit on the campus. That organization is, of course, the Academic Senate of the individual divisions of the University of California. The single most common negative response to our enlistment attempts among faculty has been that unionization will not solve our problems so effectively as a beefed-up, more powerful Senate.

It's difficult, I must confess, for me to take such a statement seriously. My immediate response is to assume either that the person in question has no money for dues but is embarrassed to confess it, or that he's afraid of professional or economic repercussions and is not willing to admit that. The reason for my incredulity is a fairly accurate knowledge of what the powers, actual and potential, of the Academic Senate are, and a skepticism that my colleagues don't know as much about those powers and their limitations as I do.

But for those who really do believe that the Academic Senate is equipped to deal effectively with the multitude of threats to academia in California today, let's go over the ground.

The only real authority exercised by the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate is in matters directly related to curriculum. It has control over courses (including University Extension), over degree conferral, and (to a lesser extent) over grading. In its meetings it may express opinions, resolutions, statements on truth and goodness and all manner of other things warm to the academician's heart, but it has no machinery or power for carrying them into effect. Even this power over matters curricular, it should be pointed out, is delegated by the Regents and may be revoked at any time. The "Eldridge Cleaver" rule governing guest speakers in courses is an example of Regental resumption of power over faculty protest.

Even were this authority over curriculum left inviolate, academic freedom, the autonomy of university professors, the continued maintenance of high-quality education in the California University system still continues to be seriously threatened. What power exists in the hands of the Senate to combat these threats? None whatsoever.

To begin with an immediate concern, salaries and/or the collective means by which employes may negotiate for merit or cost of living increases, over these the Academic Senate has no power or voice.

As to working conditions, the answer is the same. While faculty of the various divisions of the University are being asked to submit proposed sets of guidelines for their own conduct and their appropriate workload, there is not the faintest hint that these faculty-initiated documents will be determinative or even seriously influential upon the individuals and bodies who will finally formulate them. Those

who know admit that Senate members can at most hope to *influence* the final determination of rules and working conditions for faculty: they will not control it in any way.

Those of us who are concerned with fundamental questions of educational philosophy and the impact of greater institutional size on the learning experience can find no effective voice in the deliberations of the Senate. Meetings are called to take care of procedural business and are unconscionably long at that. No recognized procedure exists by which substantive issues may be discussed.

Finally, those of us who have been around UCR for several years know that the senate exercises absolutely no control over matters which strictly speaking may be extra-curricular but which have the most important implications for instruction and the very nature of education itself. The Quarter System was overwhelmingly rejected by University-wide faculty vote, but was instituted over that negative by administrative fiat. Similarly, the UCR Division strongly rejected Ivan Hinderaker's scheme of dividing the campus into administratively organized colleges. Mr. Hinderaker disregarded the oft-expressed faculty sentiment and went ahead, claiming (falsely) that resistance came from a group of conservatives who were opposed to change of any kind. Not only did the Senate have no power to prevent the Chancellor from doing what he had already determined to do, it did not even have the power to set the record straight as to its reasons for opposing the Hinderaker plan.

In these four areas the Academic Senate has no authority whatsoever. There is nothing in the Senate By-Laws which says anything about these areas; they are excluded from faculty purview when the faculty meets as the Senate. And yet these are the critical problem areas today, the areas which those reluctant to join the union claim they can deal with through the Senate. Face it, brothers and sisters, it just is not so. There is no way short of revolution (or palace coup) that the Senate can acquire a voice in these matters. And now that the administrative constituency of the Senate is so great as to constitute a balance of power vote in the Riverside Division, the chances are in serious jeopardy of even maintaining faculty control over curricular matters.

One may talk meaningfully about the A.A.U.P. as an alternative to the United Professors of California—meaningfully, that is, if the local chapter of the A.A.U.P. follows the lead of some eastern chapters and turns itself into what effectively amounts to a union. But to claim that the Senate can be invigorated and made an effective vehicle of faculty power is to claim nonsense. The Senate was never meant to be that kind of organization, and given the realities of power in the University system, it will never be.

Alan Green

## TEACHING

### Faculty Seminar on Teaching

The Faculty Seminar on Teaching will meet the second week in Winter Quarter, and weekly thereafter. The general



plan is to establish a common ground of theory with brief readings (the first: Herbert Kohl's *The Open Classroom*) and discussions centered around the readings; to experiment with micro-lab techniques and the role game Totalitarian Classroom; and to share with one another our own experiments, problems, successes and disappointments. Any faculty members or graduate students interested contact Roger Pierce for exact time and place.

☆ ★ ☆

Review: Carl R. Rogers, *Freedom to Learn: A View of What Education Might Become*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Most of us who teach in colleges are familiar with the very valuable and influential attacks on the schools by libertarian educators like Goodman, Holt, Kohl, Herndon, Dennison, and now even Charles Silberman for the Carnegie Foundation. But except for Hutchins or Riesman and Jencks we probably couldn't name one outstanding writer who has systematically and tellingly attacked the climate for learning and the quality of instruction in the colleges while offering a specific program for change, and the cause of that may be either that we are very smug or that we haven't been looking. Two such books have come to my attention just recently—*Literature and the English Department* by Barrett John Mandel and *Freedom to Learn* by Carl Rogers—and I want to review the latter here very briefly.

Out of his own long experience as a therapist, counsellor, and psychology professor Rogers distils an approach to education which requires a high degree of commitment and self-direction and permits great personal freedom for the learner. He proposes a community of learning where the teacher is a "learning facilitator" who unapologetically does his own thing and invites students to come watch or listen and who helps the student plan his own work so well that he can be relatively independent of the usual round of classes and exams if he chooses. One chapter contains a detailed description of such a course at Lewis and Clark College, and another describes how Rogers himself has taught courses in this way.

There are two chapters which focus on graduate education. One lists and discusses ten basic assumptions of graduate training, all of which Rogers attacks energetically. He is not setting up a straw man here; the assumptions do seem to define the manner of graduate education in most places. For example, two related assumptions in Rogers' list are (1) Evaluation is education, education is evaluation, and (2) Ability to pass examinations is the best criterion for student selection and for judging professional promise. He supports these by describing one Ph.D. program in psychology which requires eleven separate major exam hurdles for the student, from language exams to oral defense of the thesis. He argues that we should admit students on the basis of high intelligence (as measured in standard ways), high potential for creativity, and high ability to empathize (measured the best way we can). We should then establish a

close personal relation with the student, encourage him warmly, and free him to work as independently as he is able.

The other chapter on graduate education, entitled A Revolutionary Program For Graduate Education, even includes a letter of introduction to a graduate student entering such a program. The rationale for the program is carefully presented, reflecting Rogers' concern that he is almost sure to be misunderstood. He knows the frustration of saying to some teacher or administrator in a rigid, authoritarian school or college program, "You need to create a rich environment for learning here and then free the student so that his natural curiosity and desire to learn will permit significant and self-directed learning to occur," only to be told "Well, we already do that here."

There is a great deal more in this book, much of it a working out of Rogers' distinction between true learning and just teaching and an elaborating of the characteristics of the true learner and the true "learning facilitator."

He faces the problem of change in education realistically. The closing chapters present a specific plan for self-directed change in an educational system, a plan based on encounter groups. After being rebuffed by the Office of Education and several prominent foundations, Rogers found support for the plan; and it is now being implemented and studied in a large Catholic school district in Los Angeles.

The book concludes with a useful annotated bibliography in three parts: the need for academic revision, man and his values, and views and reviews of science.

I can only highly recommend it. I haven't read anything quite as thought-provoking on the subject of teaching and planning programs in colleges, and I know it has caused me to re-evaluate my own teaching. It caused me to remember the story of the Berkeley geology professor who finally gave up lecturing to the large first course in his department. He walked in the first day and said that he was there only to answer questions, and he stood silent until a student asked one. TAs who had worked in the course for several quarters were surprised at the insightful and persistent questions of this group, particularly on geological field trips. The professor was delighted with the student-initiated projects and papers which came in at the end of the quarter. He claimed that the few students who chose conventional readings with exams did as well on the department's traditional final exam as students in previous classes where he had lectured each class period. Can we believe him? I think so. Rogers would.

Charles R. Cooper  
School of Education

☆ ★ ☆

"Teachers must be prepared to learn from pupils, that is very, very important. Otherwise there is really no progress on the part of the students, because in a sense one would be too keen and interested in the process of making the pupils receive the expansion of one's own Ego and wanting to produce another you, rather than helping them to develop



ability of their own. So teachers must be prepared to learn from their pupils, then there is a continual rapport. Exchanging takes place all the time; then as you teach, the pupils don't get bored with you, because you develop as well. There is always something different, something new each moment so the material never runs out. One could apply this even to technical studies and the way of teaching things. It could be mathematics or science or anything at all. If the teacher is prepared to learn from the pupil then the pupil also becomes eager to give, so there is real love, and real communication takes place . . . . Of course, when one has something to say, one would generally like to just read straight through before getting any criticism or any kind of reaction from the other person, which is really based on a kind of secret fear, not being fully confident in oneself because one is afraid to show the folly of Ego. So one tends to state it as a bald fact and just leave it. Then, when the pupil can't quite take part in it, it becomes very formal and very difficult and solemn and they don't enjoy learning. They become conscious of being taught, of being told this and that, and then somehow it ceases to be creative and it doesn't really seep into their personality and enable them to develop their own ability and knowledge."

Chögyam Trungpa, *Meditation in Action*, pp. 42-43. (Shambala, 1970)

## THE FACULTY UNION

### Executive Committee Meetings

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Union meets every Tuesday noon in Watkins 1327. All union members are urged to attend; if you are not a member and would like to visit, please call Howard Sherman or another member of the Executive Committee.

☆ ★ ☆

The welfare of our students and the success of the University as an educational institution depend upon our ability to obtain qualified faculty members and upon the ability of the faculty to play an important role in the making of decisions which affect the University. Due to the size of the University and the State of California, the voice of the individual faculty member is unlikely to be heard in the councils of the great. It is for this reason that careful thought must be given to the effective organization of the college and university professors of California.

Those of us who have participated in the formation of a local chapter of the American Federation of Teachers have done so because we believe that affiliation with other teachers and with organized labor generally offers the best available means of forming a powerful yet democratic organization, possessing the strength necessary to provide a powerful voice for faculty members.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the American Federation of Teachers, in common with many, but not all, labor unions is at once democratically organized and dedicated to the highest professional standards. Thus,

virtually all decisions made by statewide or national labor organizations which affect local chapters must be ratified by a vote of the local chapter, and the local chapter is represented at all levels of labor organization by elected delegates. Although some professional organizations and some labor unions have become notorious for their overwhelming concern with the narrow financial interests of their memberships, this has not been the case with the American Federation of Teachers, which has as its primary goal the improvement of education.

The essential difference between a professional union, like the American Federation of Teachers, and other professional organizations is the acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining. Under collective bargaining, union representatives sit down with the employer and work out a mutually acceptable agreement, a contract, concerning the wages, working conditions, and facilities to be provided to the union membership. In each case, the decision as to whether such demands are to represent narrow self-interest or the improvement of education is made democratically by the membership of the local chapter.

When the employer fails to recognize the union or fails to bargain in good faith, the membership of each local chapter retains the option of seeking approval for a strike. To obtain such approval, representatives of the local chapter must present their case to their statewide labor organization or to the local labor council of which they are members. Once a strike has been approved by the local labor council and by other relevant organizations, the membership of the local chapter may vote to go out on strike.

Such a sanctioned strike is then supported by the members of all local trade unions and professional unions through grants of financial aid, legal assistance, and boycott of the offending employer. While an approved strike is in progress no member of a local union will enter or perform work on the struck campus. Deliveries will not be made, buildings will not be built, grounds will not be maintained, and classrooms will not be cleaned or heated. Statewide labor organizations acting through lobbyists and political campaigns will also exert pressure toward a favorable resolution of the strike.

While it is true that certain members of the Board of Regents, certain chancellors, or certain legislators might be content to "close down" the University for an indefinite period, they are not likely to do so if it involves an affront to organized labor. An individual legislator can afford to lose the college professor vote, but he cannot, unless he comes from a high rent district, afford to lose the vote of organized labor.

The fact that a faculty union would have available to it the option of striking does not mean that strikes are an inevitable or even a likely consequence of the organization of a faculty union. The more support that the faculty union possesses among the faculty the more serious the threat of a strike becomes, and the more likely it is that points at issue between the Administration and the Faculty will be settled by negotiation.

At the moment, and this will come as a relief to some, the local campus chapter of the American Federation of Teachers has a relatively small membership. The union we now have is, however, affiliated with the United Professors Of California, an organization of more than three thousand state college and university professors. It is affiliated with the Riverside County Central Labor Council, an organization representing thousands of union members; with the American Federation of Teachers representing 205,000 school and college teachers and with the AFL-CIO representing several million working men and women. We have access to a staff of paid professionals who provide legal advice and organizational assistance. In the past year, these professionals have presented the University's case to important legislators and they have presented faculty arguments to the Board of Regents.

Who else is representing the interests of the faculty?

Alan Beals

### Union Membership

The members of the faculty union cordially invite you to join them. Union membership has tripled in the last

quarter; we feel certain that as the impact of administrative activity this year is felt, growth will accelerate. As one faculty member said at the meeting to consider the McCorkle Report, the time has come to solidify our position and stand by it. If you would like to talk over the union, call Ron Chilcote or Alan Green; if you would like to enroll, fill out the blank and send it to Ron with a month's dues.

Please enroll me as a member of the United Professors of California:

Name ..... Social Security No. ....

Address ..... Department .....

Rank ..... Full time .... Part Time ....

Dues: Instructor: \$5/month

Asst. Prof.: \$6

Assoc. Prof.: \$9

Professor: \$12

Please bill me

Quarterly ..... Semi-annually ..... Annually ...